

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBIN W.,<sup>1</sup>

Plaintiff,

v.

ANDREW SAUL,<sup>2</sup> Commissioner of  
Social Security,

Defendant.

Case No. CV 18-4797-KK

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR  
ATTORNEY FEES PURSUANT TO 42  
U.S.C. § 406(b)

**I.**

**INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff Robin W. (“Plaintiff”)’s counsel, Irene Ruzin of the Law Offices of Irene Ruzin (“Counsel”), filed a Motion for Attorney Fees (“Motion”) pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 406(b) (“Section 406(b)"). The Motion seeks an award of \$32,779.25 for representing Plaintiff in an action to obtain disability insurance benefits. The parties have consented to the jurisdiction of the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge,

<sup>1</sup> Partially redacted in compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2(c)(2)(B) and the recommendation of the Committee on Court Administration and Case Management of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

<sup>2</sup> The Court substitutes Andrew Saul, the current Commissioner of Social Security, as Defendant in this action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d).

1 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). For the reasons stated below, the Court GRANTS the  
2 Motion.

## 3 II.

### 4 RELEVANT BACKGROUND

5 On May 30, 2018, Plaintiff filed the Complaint in this action. ECF Docket No.  
6 (“Dkt.”) 1, Compl. Plaintiff alleged the Commissioner of the Social Security  
7 Administration (“Defendant”) improperly denied Plaintiff’s application for Title II  
8 Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”). Id. On March 29, 2019, the Court entered  
9 Judgment reversing the decision of Defendant and remanding the case for further  
10 administrative proceedings. Dkt. 23, Order; Dkt. 24, Judgment.

11 On May 10, 2019, the Court issued an order approving the parties’ stipulation  
12 awarding EAJA fees to Counsel in the amount of \$5,300.00. Dkt. 26, Order  
13 Approving EAJA Fees.

14 On March 10, 2020, Counsel filed the instant Motion pursuant to Section  
15 406(b) seeking attorney fees in the amount of \$32,779.25. Dkt. 27, Mot. Counsel  
16 states 30 hours of attorney time were spent representing Plaintiff in federal court.  
17 Dkt. 31-1, Declaration of Irene Ruzin (“Ruzin Decl.”), ¶ 5, Ex. C. Counsel seeks  
18 compensation pursuant to a contingency agreement dated May 23, 2018, which  
19 provides that if Plaintiff prevails in federal court, Counsel’s fee is twenty-five percent  
20 of the past due benefits awarded. Id., ¶ 4, Ex. B.

21 On March 10, 2020, Counsel served Plaintiff with the Motion and informed  
22 her she had a right to file a response to the Motion. Dkt. 28, Proof of Service.  
23 Plaintiff has not filed a response.

24 On March 24, 2020, Defendant filed a Response to the Motion. Dkt. 29.  
25 Defendant provided an analysis of the fee request but “takes no position on the  
26 reasonableness fee request.” Id. at 5.

27 The matter thus stands submitted.

28 ///

1 **III.**

2 **DISCUSSION**

3 **A. APPLICABLE LAW**

4 Pursuant to Section 406(b):

5 Whenever a court renders a judgment favorable to a claimant under this  
6 subchapter who was represented before the court by an attorney, the  
7 court may determine and allow as part of its judgment a reasonable fee  
8 for such representation, not in excess of 25 percent of the total of the  
9 past-due benefits to which the claimant is entitled by reason of such  
10 judgment, and the Commissioner of Social Security may . . . certify the  
11 amount of such fee for payment to such attorney out of, and not in  
12 addition to, the amount of such past-due benefits.

13 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)(1)(A). Thus, “a prevailing [disability] claimant’s [attorney’s] fees  
14 are payable only out of the benefits recovered; in amount, such fees may not exceed  
15 25 percent of past-due benefits.” Gisbrecht v. Barnhart, 535 U.S. 789, 792, 122 S. Ct.  
16 1817, 152 L. Ed. 2d 996 (2002).

17 Where a claimant entered into a contingent fee agreement with counsel, a court  
18 must apply Section 406(b) “to control, not to displace, fee agreements between Social  
19 Security benefits claimants and their counsel.” Id. at 793. A court should not use a  
20 “lodestar method,” under which a district court “determines a reasonable fee by  
21 multiplying the reasonable hourly rate by the number of hours reasonably expended  
22 on the case.” Crawford v. Astrue, 586 F.3d 1142, 1148 (9th Cir. 2009) (en banc).  
23 Rather, where the claimant and counsel entered into a lawful contingent fee  
24 agreement, courts that use the “lodestar” method as the starting point to determine  
25 the reasonableness of fees requested under Section 406(b) improperly “reject the  
26 primacy of lawful attorney-client fee agreements.” Gisbrecht, 535 U.S. at 793. Thus,  
27 courts should not apply lodestar rules in cases where the claimant and counsel reached  
28 a contingent fee agreement because:

1 [t]he lodestar method under-compensates attorneys for the risk they  
2 assume in representing [social security] claimants and ordinarily produces  
3 remarkably smaller fees than would be produced by starting with the  
4 contingent-fee agreement. A district court's use of the lodestar to  
5 determine a reasonable fee thus ultimately works to the disadvantage of  
6 [social security] claimants who need counsel to recover any past-due  
7 benefits at all.

8 Crawford, 586 F.3d at 1149.

9 However, even in contingency fee cases, a court has "an affirmative duty to  
10 assure that the reasonableness of the fee [asserted by counsel] is established." Id. The  
11 court must examine "whether the amount need be reduced, not whether the lodestar  
12 amount should be enhanced." Id. The court may consider factors such as the  
13 character of the representation, the results achieved, the ratio between the amount of  
14 any benefits awarded and the time expended, and any undue delay attributable to  
15 counsel that caused an accumulation of back benefits in determining whether a lawful  
16 contingent fee agreement is reasonable. See Gisbrecht, 535 U.S. at 808; Crawford,  
17 586 F.3d at 1151.

18 Additionally, the Court must determine whether a previously awarded EAJA  
19 fee should be refunded to Plaintiff in the event both Section 406(b) and EAJA fees  
20 are awarded. "Congress harmonized fees payable by the [Agency] under EAJA with  
21 fees payable under § 406(b) out of the claimant's past-due Social Security benefits in  
22 this manner: Fee awards may be made under both prescriptions, but the claimant's  
23 attorney must 'refun[d] to the claimant the amount of the smaller fee.'" Gisbrecht,  
24 535 U.S. at 796.

## 25 **B. ANALYSIS**

26 Here, Counsel seeks a reasonable fee under Section 406(b). Plaintiff retained  
27 Counsel to represent her in federal court in her appeal from the administrative denial  
28 of benefits and agreed to pay Counsel a contingent fee of twenty-five percent of any

1 past due benefits obtained for work performed in court. See Ruzin Decl., Ex. B.  
 2 Consideration of the factors set forth in Gisbrecht and Crawford warrants no  
 3 reduction of the fee Counsel seeks.

4 The record discloses no issue regarding the quality or efficiency of Counsel's  
 5 representation before this Court, or any misconduct or delay by Counsel. Counsel  
 6 obtained a favorable outcome for Plaintiff, ultimately resulting in a remand for further  
 7 administrative proceedings and an award of past due benefits. See dkt. 24, Judgment;  
 8 Ruzin Decl., ¶ 3, 6, Exs. A, D. Further, the time expended to litigate this case, i.e. 30  
 9 hours, was reasonable and within the approved range for social security disability  
 10 cases. See Patterson v. Apfel, 99 F. Supp. 2d 1212, 1214 & n.2 (C.D. Cal. 2000)  
 11 (noting that "a survey of several dozen cases in which attorney's fees were awarded in  
 12 social security cases suggests that the 33.75 hours spent by plaintiff's counsel falls  
 13 within the approved range").

14 In addition, a fee of \$32,779.25 based on 30 hours of attorney time is  
 15 reasonable. See Ruzin Decl., ¶ 5, Ex. C. The Court finds Counsel's effective hourly  
 16 rate of approximately \$1,092.64<sup>3</sup> reasonable under the circumstances. See Villa v.  
 17 Astrue, No. CIV S-06-0846 GGH, 2010 WL 118454, at \*1-2 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 2010)  
 18 (approving Section 406(b) fees exceeding \$1,000.00 per hour, and noting "[r]educing  
 19 [Section] 406(b) fees after Crawford is a dicey business"). Further, post-Gisbrecht  
 20 decisions have approved contingency fee agreements yielding substantially higher  
 21 hourly rates to the rate Counsel seeks. See, e.g., Daniel v. Astrue, No. EDCV 04-  
 22 01188-MAN, 2009 WL 1941632, at \*2-3 (C.D. Cal. July 2, 2009) (approving fees  
 23 amounting to \$1,491.25 per hour); see also Palos v. Colvin, No. CV 15-04261-DTB,  
 24 2016 WL 5110243, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 20, 2016) (finding "an hourly rate of  
 25 \$1,546.39 for attorney and paralegal services" is reasonable). Hence, in light of the  
 26  
 27

---

28 <sup>3</sup> The Court's calculation is achieved by dividing \$32,779.25 by 30 hours of time.

1 hours Counsel expended, the Section 406(b) fee award amount Counsel requests  
2 would not represent an unfair windfall to Counsel.

3 Additionally, nothing in the record suggests any overreaching in the making of  
4 the fee agreement or any impropriety on the part of Counsel in representing Plaintiff.  
5 Counsel assumed the risk of nonpayment inherent in a contingency agreement and  
6 Counsel's efforts proved successful for Plaintiff. Accordingly, the Court finds the  
7 Section 406(b) fees Counsel requests reasonable.

8 **IV.**

9 **ORDER**

10 Based on the foregoing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** (1) Counsel's Motion  
11 for Attorney Fees Pursuant to Section 406(b) is **GRANTED**; (2) Defendant is  
12 directed to pay Counsel the sum of \$32,779.25 with a reimbursement to Plaintiff for  
13 EAJA fees previously awarded in the amount of \$5,300.00.

14  
15 Dated: April 24, 2020

16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 HONORABLE KENLY KIYA KATO  
19 United States Magistrate Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28